

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 22 are amended herein. Claims 10, 21 and 27 are canceled herein. Claims 28-30 are added herein. Claims 1-9, 11-20 and 28-30 now remain pending in the application.

Claims 1, 12 and 22 over Miner

In the Office Action, claims 1, 12 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Miner et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,021,181 ("Miner"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory. Claims 12 and 22 recite, *inter alia*, removing a deleted voice message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area.

Miner appears to disclose a virtual intercom implemented by a computer-based electronic assistant (Abstract). A voice command is received from a first party identifying a user selectable one of a plurality of subscriber parties and issues a greeting (Miner, Abstract). Individual mailboxes allow incoming messages from callers to be routed to the correct recipient (Miner, col. , lines 57-col. 6, lines 6). A throw away command causes an assistant to remove a current message from a pile and place it in the trash (Miner, col. 10, lines 33-35). Messages that have been thrown away can be retrieved via a GUI messaging tool (Miner, col. 10, lines 39-41).

Although Miner discloses being able to retrieve a voice message that has been thrown away, Miner fails to disclose that upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory, as recited by claim 1.

Although Miner discloses being able to retrieve a voice message that has been thrown away, Miner fails to disclose removing a deleted voice

message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area, as recited by claims 12 and 22.

A benefit of compressing a voice message for storage in a second memory area upon deletion is, e.g., optimizing storage capacity of the second memory area. By compressing voice messages for storage in the second memory area, the number of messages that can be stored is increased in proportion to the degree of compression used.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 12 and 22 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-24 over O'Neal

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by O'Neal, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,685 ("O'Neal"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-5 recite, *inter alia*, a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory. Claims 12-15 and 22-24 recite, *inter alia*, removing a deleted voice message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area.

O'Neal appears to disclose a unified messaging system using a server node with a telephony interface to interface with a public switched telephone network (Abstract). A web interface provides an interface to a wide area network that receives messages of a plurality of types (O'Neal, Abstract). Once a message has been played, a determination is made whether a server node has received a delete request (O'Neal, col. 9, lines 55-57). If it has, the list element corresponding to the delete request is moved from an inbox folder to a trash folder (O'Neal, col. 9, lines 57-59). At any time prior to expungement, a

message can be moved out of the trash folder back into an active folder (O'Neal, col. 9, lines 62-65).

Although O'Neal discloses being able to move a message out of a trash folder back into an active folder, O'Neal fails to disclose that upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory, as recited by claim 1.

Although O'Neal discloses being able to move a message out of a trash folder back into an active folder, O'Neal fails to disclose removing a deleted voice message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area, as recited by claims 12-15 and 22-24.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-5, 12-15 and 22-24 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 16-18 over O'Neal in view of Pickett

In the Office Action, claims 6 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by O'Neal in view of Pickett et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,266,340 ("Pickett"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6 and 16-18 are dependent on claims 1 and 12 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 12.

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory. Claims 16-18 recite, *inter alia*, removing a deleted voice message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that O'Neal fails to disclose permanently deleting performed at a predetermined time interval (Office Action, page 6). However, the Office Action relies on Pickett to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in O'Neal to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Pickett appears to disclose a system in which voice/data communications may occur in multiple modes/protocols (Abstract). Various pieces of information, i.e., the status and operation of a communications system, are retained for a predetermined period of time and then purged (Pickett, col. 53, lines 37-43; lines 50-63). A DSP performs data compression and voice compression within the system (Pickett, col. 8, lines 48-64).

Although Pickett performs data compression and voice compression in a communications system, the data compression and voice compression is **NOT** performed upon deletion of a voice message from a memory, as recited by claims 6 and 16-18.

Neither O'Neal nor Pickett, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest compression that is performed upon deletion of a voice message from a memory, as recited by claims 6 and 16-18.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6 and 16-18 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 over O'Neal in view of Garson

In the Office Action, claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by O'Neal in view of Garson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,689,550 ("Garson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 are dependent on claims 1, 12 and 22 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 12 and 22.

Claims 7 and 8 recite, *inter alia*, a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory. Claims 19 and 25 recite, *inter alia*, removing a deleted voice message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that O'Neal fails to disclose deleting a deleted voice message when deleted voice messages reach a predetermined number (Office Action, page 7). However, the Office Action relies on Garson to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in O'Neal to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Garson appears to disclose a call-detail-report in a delete queue that is deleted after it reaches its limit by percentage of memory or by number of records (col. 16, lines 23-32).

Garson discloses a delete queue containing a call-detail-report. Garson fails to disclose a novel method and apparatus for handling a deleted voice message, much less compression of a deleted voice message, as recited by claims 7, 8, 19 and 25.

Neither O'Neal nor Garson, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest compression that is performed upon deletion of a voice message from a memory, as recited by claims 7, 8, 19 and 25.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7, 8, 19 and 25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 20 and 26 over O'Neal in view of Sweet

In the Office Action, claims 9, 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by O'Neal in view of Sweet et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,163,085 ("Sweet"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9, 20 and 25 are dependent on claims 1, 12 and 22 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 12 and 22.

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory. Claims 20 and 25 recite, *inter alia*, removing a deleted voice message, upon deletion from a first memory area, compressing the deleted voice message, and storing the deleted voice message memory in a second memory area.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that O'Neal fails to disclose deleting a deleted voice message when deleted voice messages reach a predetermined percentage of a capacity of a trash bin (Office Action, page 8). However, the Office Action relies on Sweet to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in O'Neal to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Sweet appears to disclose a digitally implemented central dictation system that allows users designated as dictators to input voice files for later retrieval and transcription (Abstract). Old voice files are deleted on a first in first out basis (Sweet, col. 12, lines 53-60). Incoming digitized voice signals are compressed by line interface controllers (Sweet, col. 12, lines 53-60).

Sweet discloses using compression of digitized voice signals as they are being received on incoming line interface controllers. Sweet fails to disclose a novel method and apparatus for handling a deleted voice message, much less compression of a deleted voice message, as recited by claims 9, 20 and 26.

Neither O'Neal nor Sweet, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest compression that is performed upon deletion of a voice message from a memory, as recited by claims 9, 20 and 26.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 9, 20 and 26 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11, 21 and 27 over O'Neal in view of Newton

In the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 21 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by O'Neal in view of Newton, U.S. Patent No. 5,978,757 ("Newton"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 10, 21 and 27 are canceled herein, making the rejection of claims 10, 21 and 27 now moot.

Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that O'Neal fails to disclose compressing a deleted voice message stored in a trash bin (Office Action, page 8). However, the Office Action relies on Newton to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in O'Neal to arrive at the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Newton appears to disclose a voice messaging system that compresses voice messages as voice memory fills (Abstract). While memory utilization is low, messages can be maintained in memory using a high voice quality, low compression ratio

(Newton, Abstract). As memory utilization is shrunk due to the storage of more messages, previously stored or other selected voice messages are re-compressed at a higher compression ratio (Newton, Abstract).

Newton discloses varying a compression ratio for stored voice messages in a voice messaging system. Newton fails to disclose, teach or suggest a novel method and apparatus for the handling of deleted voice messages, much less a voice message that, upon deletion, is compressed and moved to a deleted voice message memory, as recited by claim 11.

Neither O'Neal nor Sweet, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a voice message that is initially stored in a voice message memory, and upon deletion of the voice message from the voice message memory, the voice message is compressed, moved and restored in a deleted voice message memory, as recited by claim 11.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 11 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307

WHB/df